

SOME 'WESTERN' VARIANTS IN THE TEXT
OF ACTS

BENJAMIN W. BACON

YALE UNIVERSITY

IN his article published in the issues of the American Journal of Theology for January and April 1919 (Vol. XXIII), under the title 'Fact and Fancy in Theories Concerning Acts,' my respected colleague Professor Charles C. Torrey appears to resent my characterization as "philological" of the type of criticism displayed in his able articles. The term, however, bears no disparaging connotation, and was not so intended. It was, and will be, employed by the present writer simply to distinguish a particular mode of approach to this outstanding problem of New Testament criticism. The mode chosen by Torrey to the exclusion of all others is 'philological,' as distinguished from the mode exemplified in the 'historical' (or, as Torrey prefers to call it, the "theologico-conjectural") type represented by such scholars as Harnack,¹ Schürer, Windisch, Preuschen, Loisy, and others. The present reply to his strictures has been long delayed, awaiting Ropes's "Text of Acts" in Volume III of "The Beginnings of Christianity," in which the long-debated question of the 'Western' Text is discussed with what may be hoped to be advance toward its settlement.

If in the present essay the type of criticism which Torrey brings to the common problem is still designated 'philological,' it must be understood that the term implies no minimizing of Torrey's great attainments in the fields both of textual and higher criticism. Its only applicability lies in the fact that in the particular case of Acts, he explicitly repudiates suggestions

¹ Harnack's *Beiträge* exemplify both types. In their foundation they are markedly philological, but the philological results are applied to problems of the higher, or historical, criticism.

from the latter of these two lines of approach, while his proposals, not yet published, for the solution of the textual problem have proved less acceptable to other scholars than the more familiar solution supported by Ropes. Torrey holds that critics should limit themselves exclusively to the philological line of approach, in other words to his theory of a single Aramaic document of 49 A.D. underlying Acts 1-15, 33, and that this theory supplies the solution for all problems arising from this remarkable work of Luke² throughout its whole extent. Surely no apology is required for applying the term 'philological' to this type of criticism.³

Philological criticism has probably carried as far as this method allows the evidence that in 'I Acts' (Acts 1, 1-15, 33) the author of the work and continuator of the gospel has made use of an Aramaic source or sources; whereas in 'II Acts' (Acts 15, 34-28, 31) the source, or sources, are Greek. Whatever else may be proved by the facts of translation Greek, it is to be hoped that the day is past when the problem of Acts could be regarded as soluble without the assumption of written sources. These were brought together by Luke through processes of literary adjustment analogous to those employed for his combination of Mark with other evangelic material in his gospel. Whatever the relative age of the two component parts, whether the Aramaic material of I Acts, with Peter as its chief actor, or the Greek material of II Acts, with Paul as its chief

² The designation 'Luke' is applied to the compiler or author of Luke-Acts in accordance with tradition, and without prejudice to the question of the real authorship.

³ The boast of our modern Boaz, that when he is done reaping, Ruth's job will be fruitless, has much to justify it if restricted in application to his own self-limited field. His mistake lies in supposing that the world is dependent on the grain of that particular area. It is natural enough that the farmer (and for that matter the homesteader who staked out the field before him) should feel a certain jealousy of the grain dealer who, without participation in the toils of seedtime and harvest, buys up the produce of a thousand fields. If the grain collector be indeed ignorant of and unsympathetic with the producer's art, a certain measure of contempt may perhaps not unjustly mingle with this jealousy. The pretended higher critic who does not, in order to reach his own field, intelligently traverse the intervening regions of philological exegesis and textual criticism, is not worthy of the name he assumes, nor will his speculations stand the test of scholarship. Such a critic will share the fate of the 'middleman' who has no service of his own to contribute. The service rendered by others will speak for itself.

actor, be the earlier in date; whether either of the two parts is of one piece throughout; the ultimate result of purely philological criticism is to transfer the inquiry to another field. Exegesis is indeed advanced a stage further by the evidences of translation in I Acts; but exegesis alone, whether on the basis of the Greek text, or with the reinforcement of philological criticism, does not suffice. Other questions remain which, as the editors of "The Beginnings of Christianity" have shown, can be solved only by the methods employed by the higher critic, a comparison of ideas reflected from different literary strata, but brought into more or less harmonious subordination to the paramount purpose of the author. In spite of Torrey's protest that acceptance of his theory of Luke as translator of I Acts and personal author of II Acts leaves nothing more to be done by what we have ventured to call 'historical' criticism, the very data he himself supplies constitute an urgent call for precisely those methods of source-analysis the efficacy of which in Old Testament narrative he willingly admits, but which he declares to be "fanciful" in Acts.⁴

Another stage of the inquiry is reached with the appearance of Ropes's discussion of the 'Western' text of Acts. The author may not have solved the long-debated question of the 'Western' variants, but at least he has provided a basis for

⁴ Like Colenso's Zulu interpreter, who pointed out to the bishop unobserved discrepancies in the Pentateuch, a second-century reviser of the text of Acts may have been more sensitive to difficulties of substance than a modern grammarian panoplied in a theory of translation Greek which postulates a flawless Aramaic original. An example may be found in the 'Western' additions to the story of the Philippian earthquake in Acts 16, 35 ff. The supposed Aramaic original having ceased at 15, 33 Torrey can see no further obstacles to the traditional view that a personal follower of Paul, present on occasion of the earthquake, wrote this account as an eye-witness less than fifteen years after. Those keenest to "keep their own tradition" regardless of consequences to "the word of God" are naturally gratified by a view which confirms their opinion of the reporter's name, even if his veracity should suffer. The 'Western' transcriber finds difficulties. He finds it hard to visualize a domesticated earthquake which plays around the heels of Paul and Silas, not affecting any save these favored individuals, leaves the household of the jailer undisturbed, and remains quite imperceptible to the rest of the population of Philippi. He therefore introduces a whole series of brief supplements to eliminate the improbabilities. The jailer "makes fast the other prisoners," the magistrates "remember the earthquake," and act accordingly, etc. To Torrey such difficulties are mere "fancy."

further work. The problem is intricate and delicate. Other theories may be presented to account for the curious phenomenon of a "rewriting" of Acts early in the second century, at a period when the multiplication of copies and standardization of the text through canonization had not yet taken place, and when (as we may add) the accusations brought by Marcion against the church of having garbled and interpolated the Lukan writings had not yet made such free treatment impracticable, and other explanations of individual variants may be adopted in preference to those of Ropes; but on the whole his work seems to us convincing. In selecting five representative 'Western' variants from the central chapters of Acts, and adopting in each case Ropes's explanation of their purpose and origin, we shall be taking no step not warranted by good authority. Here again exegesis is reinforced by able and conscientious scholarship from a different, though allied, field. And yet Ropes is himself careful to acknowledge that problems still remain. The "exegetical difficulties" are in fact in most cases the occasion of the 'Western' variants themselves; hence, so far from removing the difficulties, restoration of the true text only brings them into sharper relief, proving them no mere "fancy" of modern historical or documentary critics, but apparent even to second-century readers. Again, therefore, after the textual critic has had his say, the call for documentary criticism, that is source-criticism, only becomes more urgent than before.

Ropes is himself a careful exegete, but when acting as a textual critic he conscientiously limits himself to his task. He asks only what Luke wrote, not how the situation came about which called forth the effort to rewrite. Thus he admits, without trying to account for them, the exegetical difficulties of Acts 14, 3. The 'Western' addition before the verse is intended to remove them. Ropes only shows us this indisputable fact and discards the 'Western' reading. He leaves it to philologists, exegetes, and higher critics to determine why the true text should display 'difficulties' so apparent that second-century transcribers should resort to rewriting. Similarly in Acts 11, 20 Ropes suggests as an exegete that the authentic

reading Ἑλληνιστάς may perhaps admit of a sense which would not be absurd in the context, though admittedly so difficult and unusual that not only the 'Western' transcriber changed the word to Ἑλληνας, but all modern versions adopt the correction. As a faithful textual critic Ropes chooses the uncorrected in preference to the corrected reading. As an exegete he struggles to find a possible sense for it. The question why in two instances (here and in 9, 20) Luke should vary from his usual unambiguous and simple classification of hearers of the gospel message as Jews and Greeks (Ἰουδαίους καὶ Ἑλληνας), to introduce the unusual and ambiguous term 'Hellenists,' he leaves to higher critics such as Loisy, who has, as we shall see, a very simple explanation to offer.

Another instance of this scholarly reserve is Ropes's enumeration (pp. ccxxxviii ff.) of thirteen 'Western' variants "with substantial content," of which two (19, 9 'from the fifth hour to the tenth,' and 12.10 'the seven steps') may be regarded "as perhaps implying real additional knowledge." With or without "substantial content" 'Western' variants which have no claim to be regarded as from Luke's own hand go into the discard, so far as the textual critic is concerned. Whence the real additional knowledge could have been derived is not of primary concern to him. The higher critic may find a use for these vagrants if he can and will. As a textual critic Ropes sets these thirteen variants of substantial content but unknown origin apart from the five presumably Lukan readings in which "the corruption is probably on the side of the non-western text," namely, Ἰωνάθας in 4, 6, the omission of 'things strangled' in 15, 20.29 and 21, 25, 'Trogyllia' in 20, 15, 'Myra' in 21, 1, and 'for fifteen days' in 27, 5. The student of the Lukan *text* of Acts is rightly grateful for the restored five readings which the usual text had lost. But the student of the whole problem of Acts will naturally take some interest in the thirteen strays which floated in from the flotsam and jetsam of the first half of the second century. They belong in the same class with the story of the woman taken in adultery, which became attached to our gospels at various points some time after the fourth century. The Pericope Adulterae belongs to the true

text neither of Luke nor John. Eusebius knew it only from the version of Papias and the Gospel according to the Hebrews. Nevertheless it has an interesting story of its own to tell to the higher critic who is seeking not the mere text but also the sources of Luke.

It appears, then, that after the textual critic has done his work, yes, even after the philologist has solved all questions by the "facts" of mistranslation from Aramaic documents, there still remains a field of inquiry for the student of sources.

Ropes tells us that the 'Western' text of Acts stands for more than a mere accumulation of variants, as maintained by von Dobschütz and others, and is not another form from the hand of Luke himself (as Blass tried to prove). He holds that it represents a deliberate "rewriting" of the work, "made before, and perhaps long before, the year 150, by a Greek-speaking Christian who knew something of Hebrew, in the East, perhaps in Syria or Palestine." From the surreptitious insertion of a 'we' in the 'Western' text of 11, 27 he 'guesses' that the place may have been Antioch. Accepting this, or something like it, as the latest verdict of the textual criticism of Acts, the task of the higher critic is easily defined. The problem laid at his door is the further question which the textual critic expressly and properly declines to attack, why it should have been thought necessary to rewrite Luke's work.

Ropes says (p. ccxlv): "The reviser's aim was to improve the text, not to restore it, and he lived not far from the time when the New Testament canon in its nucleus was first definitely assembled." The pregnant hint that the work was done in connection with the first assembling of a Catholic canon is an intimation that it was not the task of some obscure individual. No mere *ιδιώτης* of the North Syrian church sat down to accomplish it, saying, 'Go to, now, this man Luke has a style inferior to mine and commits errors of fact and expression on every page. I will rewrite his work for him.' Perhaps it is not impossible that a second-century Christian should have thus thought more highly of himself than he ought to think, but it *is* impossible that he should have secured for such a revision a currency which quite eclipsed the authentic text, and, but

for its survival in a few old codices in Alexandria, would have buried it for ever out of sight. Why was it thought necessary to 'rewrite' the Book of Acts at Antioch early in the second century, and why was the rewriting for so long a time approved? That is the substance of the higher critic's present inquiry. He seeks his answer in the intentional changes of the rewritten text as revealed by the uncorrected text of the Old Uncials.

We may subdivide these intentional changes into two classes: (1) those that reveal nothing more than the attempt to get over a difficulty; (2) those that indicate better knowledge than Luke's, or at least another conception of the facts. I will adduce a few examples of each type for the light they may throw on the question propounded.

Of the exegetical difficulties of Acts 14, 3 and 11, 20 we have already spoken. Ropes thinks it possible to overcome them in 11, 20 by giving to the term *Ἑλληνιστάς* a sense which it obviously did not bear to the author of the correction. Undoubtedly we should first call upon the exegete to do his best with the text as Luke wrote it, before we call in the aid of the higher critic to suggest an explanation based on Luke's supposed combination of sources. But the difficulties may accumulate beyond the power of the exegete to solve. Then, if the point is reached where a single critical hypothesis can be advanced, adequate to cover all the difficulties, reasonable in itself if not actually required on independent grounds, the thoughtful reader will be inclined to accept the higher critic's solution as the true one.

We may limit ourselves for the present to Acts 10-15, since these six chapters cover the central theme of the book, which Luke expresses in the phrase, "This salvation of God is given to the gentiles." From the end of the work we trace it back to 11, 18 in the form: "Then to the gentiles also hath God granted repentance unto life," with equivalent expressions in 11, 1 and 14, 27. The theme seems to have been uppermost in Luke's mind from the time when he depicted as the opening scene of Jesus' ministry the rejection at Nazareth, which the Lord met by citing the sending of Elijah and Elisha to the gentiles. The curious thing is that in two cases before Luke's

ending in 28, 17-31, a 'finis' had already been written to this theme, once in 11, 1-18 and again in 15, 1-33.

Apart from the constantly reiterated scene of the apostles offering their message first in the synagogue, and only turning to the gentiles after the jealous Jews have put it from them, judging themselves unworthy of eternal life, the general conception moves in the three following stages:

(1) Dispersion of the disciples by persecution. The Jews drive out the believers, as they had previously slain the prophets and the Lord, but the blood of the martyrs becomes the seed of the church. The martyrdom of Stephen results in a scattering of the hellenistic branch of the church before the conversion of Paul, though the apostles remain unmolested. We may call this 'the dispersion of the Hellenists.' The gospel is carried as far as Ethiopia on the south, Cyprus and Antioch on the north. A second persecution by Agrippa I, seeking the favor of the Pharisees for his party of the Herodians, strikes at the apostles themselves. James son of Zebedee is beheaded, Peter imprisoned though later released. The 'dispersion of the apostles' in consequence of this turning of the reconstituted Jewish state against their body marked an epoch for the early church. It was dated exactly "twelve years" after the Ascension, and was supposed to mark the expiration of the *locus paenitentiae* appointed for the Jewish people. In all probability the dating is correct, since Agrippa's pro-pharisaic, anti-christian policy must have been adopted shortly after his accession at the feast of tabernacles of the year 41, and the events of Acts 12, 1-19a may be assigned to passover A.D. 42, that is, twelve years after Calvary; for it is a mistake to regard verses 20-24 as allowing no interval between the persecution and Agrippa's death (on the contrary the ancient lectionary system of Codex Laudianus properly divides after vs. 19a). The remainder, down to verse 24 (inclusive?), forms a digression relating the awful fate which overtook the murderous tyrant, after which the story of the spread of the gospel is resumed.⁵ The mission-story follows immediately, as Luke has arranged his material, giving in Acts 13, 1 ff. the story of the first mis-

⁵ For a similar prolepsis see Luke 3, 18-20.

sionary journey, which, however, has Antioch, not Jerusalem, as its point of departure. Moreover it is carried out, not by Peter, just miraculously released, but by Barnabas and Saul. Still, the collocation of persecution with subsequent dissemination of the gospel is sufficiently close to indicate that Luke was by no means blind to the significance of the event as conceived by Paul in 1 Thess. 2, 14-16, and in documents such as the *Kerygma Petri* which support the twelve-year epoch.

(2) The second stage of the story relates, of course, the actual evangelization of the gentiles, great stress being usually laid on divine direction as explicitly commanding this. The notice in 11, 19 f., of certain hellenistic refugees from "the persecution that arose about Stephen," men of Cyprus and Cyrene, who without special authorization "spoke to the Greeks (or rather, in the true reading, Hellenists) also," is in this respect exceptional. Philip had to be specially directed by the Spirit to address the eunuch of Ethiopia; Peter was elaborately prepared to meet the desire of Cornelius, the "prophets and teachers" of Antioch were divinely charged to send out Barnabas and Saul; for Paul himself it was necessary to find scriptural warrant for "turning to the gentiles" after the Jews rejected the gospel at Antioch of Pisidia. Luke is determined to leave without excuse the Jews who object to gentile participation in "this salvation of God."

A second important element in this second stage of the story is the official endorsement of the work of evangelization by the leaders of the church, overcoming the protest of the legalists that "it is needful to circumcise them and to teach them to keep the law of Moses." Luke is very emphatic regarding the divine guidance of the church on this point also. Both on the occasion of Peter's conversion and baptism of Cornelius and his household and later when the objection is renewed in the case of the gentile converts of Barnabas and Paul, the apostolic spokesman wins the full assent of the entire church to the doctrine that gentile believers are sufficiently "purified" by their faith alone, entirely without obligations under the Mosaic law. According to Luke the Jews are to observe the law with undiminished fidelity, maintaining their caste-purity. Believing

gentiles are to be free from any obligation whatever under the law of Moses, their faith alone making them acceptable to God. For Luke the apostolic spokesman on both occasions is Peter. Neither at the conclave of Acts 11, 1-18 nor at the council of Acts 15 has Paul any part in securing this great triumph for gentile Christianity. He merely bears witness on the second occasion to the divine grace which had accompanied his preaching with Barnabas in Cyprus and Galatia. Thus the credit for gentile freedom is given by Luke exclusively to Peter. Barnabas and Paul are represented as passive instruments of the Holy Ghost. The first missionary journey is not due to their initiative, nor do they have any part save their witness-bearing in the decision of the Jerusalem council.

(3) But to the view of first-century Christianity the mere admission of gentiles to full standing as fellow-heirs of the promises entirely without obligations under the Mosaic law was but the first, and by far the easiest, step to be taken by the church.

The third stage described in the record, one which cannot logically precede the second, deals with the problem entailed for converted Jews by the admission to church fellowship of gentiles not bound to circumcision nor the Mosaic distinctions of meats. The converted Jews are spoken of in Acts as "the Jews which are among the gentiles." They belong, of course, not in Palestine, but in the diaspora, and are described as listening to the reading of Moses in the synagogue from generations of old "in every city" of the Graeco-Roman world. Chapter 15 and 21, 17-26 are deeply concerned for these "Jews which are among the gentiles," and the representation is not only that Paul acquiesced on their account in the food-law enacted in Jerusalem, forbidding the use of *eidolothyta* and blood, together with the grosser "pollutions of idols," but that he and Silas promulgated the decree in Galatia as an official settlement of the dispute. We are even told that on his subsequent visit to James in Jerusalem Paul took public action to prove that there was no truth in the report that he disregarded the distinctions when on gentile soil. On this third issue Paul appears in Acts as standing on the Jewish-Christian side against

the gentile. Luke actually asserts that Paul engaged in the sacrificial service for the nazirites in the temple for the express purpose of proving that under the stated circumstances he himself set an example to his fellow Jews among gentiles of "walking orderly keeping the law," and that he taught them to circumcise their children and keep the customs. The instance of his circumcising Timothy in Galatia is adduced as a case in point. Titus, example of the opposite principle (Gal. 2, 3), nowhere appears in Acts. Luke certainly leaves no form of emphasis unemployed to manifest his belief that the solution adopted by the council of Jerusalem at the instance of Antioch had the explicit sanction of the Holy Ghost as well as of all the apostles and representative leaders of the church, specifically including Paul! Whether he is correct in his representation of Peter as the divinely chosen apostle to the gentiles, through whom the door of faith was first opened to them, and who consistently championed their complete equality in the faith, and in his representation of Paul as endorsing the apostolic food-law enacted at Jerusalem, siding with those who insisted that only gentiles, and not Jews, were at liberty to disregard the Mosaic distinctions, is quite another question.

It has been necessary to state clearly and at some length the three stages in which Luke relates the transition of the faith from a particularistic to a universalistic basis, because the few 'Western' readings which I have selected for our consideration from the chapters of Acts especially concerned with this issue are admittedly due to certain exegetical difficulties, and higher critics believe that these grow out of Luke's attempt to blend together two or more inconsistent accounts of the great transition, while exegetes do their best to explain them without such recourse. Let us see what exegesis can do.

Acts 11, 20 makes the substitution in the 'Western' text of Ἑλλήνας for Ἑλληνιστάς, obviously because the immediate context requires it. There is no question about the correction or its motive. The only question is why Luke should have departed from his usual division of hearers of the word into "Jews and Greeks" (Ἰουδαῖοι καὶ Ἕλληνες) in relating how certain Cyrenian and Cypriote converts did not restrict themselves to

the circumcision but proclaimed the gospel to gentiles also, thus giving rise to the half-gentile church of Antioch. In relating this, Luke substitutes the unusual term 'Hellenists'⁶ to signify gentiles, instead of the simple expression 'Greeks' which he ordinarily employs. Ropes thinks 'Hellenists,' as meaning 'Greek-speaking persons,' could be used to denote uncircumcised gentiles. He does not appear to deny that it would be ambiguous, nor does he explain why Luke should adopt the "unusual," ambiguous expression, in preference to the usual one which admitted no ambiguity. The present writer, who agrees that the 'Western' reading is an intentional correction of Luke's text, explained in an article entitled 'The Chronological Scheme of Acts' (Harvard Theological Review, XIV, 1921, pp. 137-166) that Luke felt it desirable to change the reading of his source from 'Greeks' to 'Greek-speaking persons' because his own theory of the beginnings of systematic evangelization of gentiles made it date from the direction of the Spirit to the church at Antioch (13, 1 ff.), so that ascription of its beginnings to nameless unauthorized refugees at an earlier time was inadmissible. He makes in fact the same change in the story of Paul's first evangelistic efforts, though Paul himself emphatically declares these to have been directed to gentiles, for in Acts 9, 29 he transforms these gentile converts of Paul into 'Greek-speaking persons' (here certainly meaning Jews) in Jerusalem. Loisy gives the same explanation as ours of the strange 'Ελληνιστάς in his Commentary, published in 1920 but not available to the present writer till long after the publication of the article above referred to. He says:

The editor, who does not wish to bring up the question of legal observances until after the mission of Barnabas and Paul in Cyprus and south-eastern Asia Minor, apparently wishes to suggest that it was this mission which 'opened the door of faith to the gentiles' (14, 27; cf. 11, 18). The transposition effected by him accordingly required that no Greek-Christian community should be admitted to exist at Antioch, and that he represent the gospel as having been preached to the "Hellenists" of Antioch, not to gentiles.

⁶ How unusual it was may be judged by the perplexity of the original scribe of \mathfrak{N} , who, finding the four letters $\lambda\lambda\eta\nu$ of his exemplar illegible in the word 'Ελληνιστάς could make no better guess at the word than to substitute the six letters $\nu\alpha\gamma\gamma\epsilon\lambda$, to obtain $\epsilon\upsilon\alpha\gamma\gamma\epsilon\lambda\iota\sigma\tau\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$.

It is for the reader to decide whether exegesis gives an adequate explanation of Luke's strange use of terms, or whether the reason must be sought in his attempt to adjust the inconsistencies of his sources.

In the case of Acts 14, 2, where the 'Western' text appends before verse 3 the addition, "But the Lord (suddenly) gave peace," there will be no disposition to question Ropes's explanation:

The motive of the 'Western' addition in this verse is plainly to overcome the exegetical difficulties of vs. 3 on the assumption that two stages of persecution, a brief lighter one and another more violent, were separated by a period of peace.

Ropes does not attempt, however, to explain or remove these exegetical difficulties. Others had resorted to various means to explain why after starting to tell of the division caused by Paul's preaching among the Jews of Iconium, leading to a riot and threats of stoning in verses 4-7, Luke should interrupt himself to say: "Long time, therefore, they continued their stay, speaking boldly in the Lord, who bare witness to the word of his grace, granting signs and wonders to be done by their hands." Some propose transposition, making verse 3 follow verse 1. Others consider verse 3 an editorial comment inappropriately placed. Still others regard it as a bit of source-material included by Luke out of unwillingness to lose it. Ropes somewhat strengthens the case of these last by adopting the suggestion of Torrey that the *ἐπι* added by **NA** after *μαρτυροῦντι* represents an Aramaic 'al, a marked and curious Semitism. He thinks *ἐπι* belongs to the original text, which most of the manuscripts correct. If so, verse 3, strongly reminiscent as it is of 4, 29 f., may well be redactional, but not the work of Luke. It will have survived from some earl'er redaction.

But all these explanations rest on the higher criticism. Ropes with commendable reserve leaves the exegete to struggle as he may with the question why verse 3 should thus interrupt the context. But the higher critic need go no further in this case than to remark that the 'Western' addition, "But the Lord (suddenly) gave peace," after Acts 14, 2 does not stand alone. The addition of verse 34 after 15, 35 has exactly the

same motive, to meet the exegetical difficulty that Paul should take Silas with him from Antioch when Silas has just left Antioch with Judas to return to Jerusalem. The 'Western' text removed the difficulty by adding, "However, it seemed good to Silas to remain there, and only Judas departed." Unfortunately this method of removing difficulties no longer satisfies the reader. 'Western' violence only makes it the more certain that the objection taken by the higher critic is no illusion. The difficulty is a real difficulty, which no exegesis, ancient or modern, avails to remove. As Torrey himself notices, chapters 13-15, though inseparable in content from II Acts, are affiliated linguistically with I Acts.

The three 'Western' readings in Acts 11, 20; 14, 2; and 15, 34, all admittedly later corrections of the text of Luke, are alike in being obvious attempts to remove difficulties. The transcriber attempts to build a bridge for the reader's feet over manifest gaps and chasms in the road. Sometimes the arch is made to spring from the redactor's side, as in 14, 2 and 15, 34, sometimes from that of the source (if source it be which creates the difficulty), as in 11, 20. That is according to apparent requirement. Whichever of the two conceptions seems most in need of the reviser's help gets it. But we have other 'Western' variants in the same group of chapters which go quite beyond the mere attempt to smooth out the reader's path. In the two cases remaining to be cited they very decidedly alter Luke's meaning, and that not in the direction of facilitation, but (at least in one case) of increasing the exegetical difficulty.

In Acts 11, 1 f., Luke (if we may so designate the compiler as distinct from the source) unquestionably means the reader to understand that Peter is only temporarily absent from Jerusalem. In Acts 8-9 Jerusalem is headquarters for all the apostles, and Peter and John in 8, 25 return there after their visit to Samaria. We are expressly told in 8, 1 and 8, 14 that the apostles remained in Jerusalem unmolested by the persecution that arose about Stephen; in 9, 27 Paul finds them still there, an unbroken body. Again later, after Peter's peregrination of 9, 32 ff., which brings him to Lydda, Joppa, and Caesarea, we

still find him a resident of Jerusalem with the other apostles and leaders of the church when Herod Agrippa in chapter 12 puts forth his hand to destroy it, beheads James, and proceeds to take Peter also. On his release Peter goes to the house of Mary, where the rest are gathered praying for his deliverance, and before departing "to another place" leaves a farewell message for James the head of the Jerusalem brotherhood. Manifestly the early chronographers, who uniformly understand this story of Herod's persecution as marking the 'dispersion of the Twelve,' in particular Peter's departure for Rome in the second year of Claudius, "twelve years" after the crucifixion, have correctly interpreted Luke. Peter's departure from Jerusalem related in Acts 12, 17 really is intended, both in the source which Luke is here following and by Luke himself, to mark the end of his residence in Jerusalem.

Why then does the 'Western' reviser introduce after 11, 1 a very long addition which clearly implies that Peter has already ceased to regard Jerusalem as his domicile and is settled in the Coastland Plain (Shephelah), directing the affairs of a Christian community distinct from that of Jerusalem and independent of it? We cite herewith the addition, which involves, as Ropes says, a complete rewriting of verses 1 and 2:

Now it was reported to the apostles and brethren in Judea that the gentiles also had received the word of God. But Peter, indeed, had been intending for a considerable time to make a journey to Jerusalem; so then, calling to him the brethren he established them, making a long discourse, and (passed) through the (intervening) regions, teaching them (namely, the disciples). Moreover he met them (namely, the apostles and brethren) and reported to them the grace of God. But the brethren that were of the circumcision disputed with him saying: Thou wentest in to men uncircumcised.

The change from the usual form of the text certainly does not remove an exegetical difficulty; it aggravates one which otherwise might not be conspicuous. And textual critics suggest no motive for the change unless it be a reminder that in the gospels and also in Acts 'Western' transcribers show a disposition to assimilate parallels. If such be the motive here, we must at least admit that the interpolator observed the close parallelism between what is here described as Peter's journey to Jerusalem to vindicate his mission to gentiles and what is

described in 15, 1-5 as a journey of Paul and Barnabas from Antioch to Jerusalem with the same object. But heightening of the parallelism can hardly have been the transcriber's only motive for so extensive an addition. Whence came this non-lukan conception, if indeed it be not "real additional knowledge"?

As in the case of 14, 3, Ropes calls our attention to certain marked Semitisms in the 'Western' text of 11, 1 difficult to imagine in a Greek writer attempting to improve upon a Greek author. Ropes meets this difficulty by adopting the 'Western' ἀκουστὸν δὲ ἐγένετο τοῖς ἀποστόλοις καὶ τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς as authentic (though not the succeeding solecism οἱ ἐν τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ), the Alexandrian transcribers having "rewritten" in this case. We will, accordingly, hold the 'Western' scribe responsible only for the long addition. But why did he gratuitously introduce so obvious an exegetical difficulty? The textual critic scarcely offers a reply.

I will add but one more variant, the most noted and most drastic of all the 'Western' changes, namely the transformation of the food-law of the Jerusalem council in 15, 29 and connected passages into "a brief summary of fundamental Christian morals" (obligatory, of course, on all alike) by the addition of the Golden Rule (in negative form). To this outstanding 'Western' variant Ropes devotes an excursus in his compact Detached Note (pp. 265-269). It is perhaps not too much to expect that his thorough and scientific treatment may bring to an end the long dispute as to this variant. His conclusion is so clear and so concise, and withal so well supported by the evidence, that I may be pardoned for transcribing it entire:

The history of the text seems to have been as follows. In the East the Decree was correctly understood in the second century and later to relate to food, and under the influence of current custom the text was at first expanded by the addition of καὶ πνικτων. This application of the ancient prohibition of blood, so as to include all flesh improperly slaughtered, is known to have been an early Christian usage (Tertullian, *Apolog.* 9; cf. Justin, *Dial.* 20), as well as current with the Jews, and in the second century the introduction of an express mention of it into the text would not have seemed a substantial alteration. To Africa, however, the Decree came (in the 'Western' Greek text of Acts) in its original form, without this addition, and there it commonly received (so already Tertullian, *De pudicitia*, 12) a moral interpretation

(αἵματος being taken as referring to murder). No Latin text seems to have contained the addition of 'things strangled' before the time of Jerome.

The addition of the (negative) Golden Rule, which sprang from this moral interpretation and made over the Decree fully into a brief summary of fundamental Christian morals, was effected in Greek copies of the second century (Irenaeus), and so passed into the Latin version as early as the time of Cyprian's *Testimonia* in the third century. Whether the Golden Rule was first added in East or West is uncertain. In any case the addition ultimately made its way not only into the briefer 'Western' text but also, not later than the third or fourth century (cf. sah), into some forms of the expanded B-text.

If our choice lay between the B-text and that of Irenaeus, the former would have to be preferred, since the text of Irenaeus implies the (secondary) moral interpretation of the Decree, but the text of Tertullian, simpler than either of the other two, suits all requirements for a text underlying both of them. In a word, any text of which the Golden Rule was an *integral part*, would have to be rejected as a later modification of the original.

This time the ulterior Why receives somewhat more extensive consideration. According to Ropes the 'Western' copyist was simply following the moral interpretation of the decree generally current in his own time (early in the second century) when he made it over "into a brief summary of fundamental Christian morals." But back of this textual solution lies a further question: why was this change of the sense found to be necessary and desirable? It is only part of the truth to say that by the first decades of the second century the elaborate provisions against "pollutions of idols" in the authentic decree had already begun to break down. This appears from the letters to the churches of Asia which preface and commend the Apocalypse of John (Rev. 1-3), and can be dated with great certainty in "the end of the reign of Domitian" (ca. 95 A.D.). Here only the two provisions which could be sustained on moral grounds, and which for this reason had Paul's support (complete in the one case, partial in the other), I mean "fornication and *idolothya*," are still insisted on. The Didaché, a little later, shows similar wavering, even in Northern Syria, emanation point of the Decree:

As concerning foods bear what thou art able; yet abstain at all events from *idolothya*, for to partake of them is the worship of dead gods.

Clearly by the middle of the second century the provisions of the decree, enunciated by Luke with such an overwhelming

display of authority, human and divine, had begun to yield to a broader and simpler requirement than either Paul's or Luke's, a requirement in which the original purpose of protecting "the Jews which are among the Gentiles" from "pollutions" is quite lost sight of. The Mosaic distinctions of meats have no divine authority. Fornication and *idolothyta* cannot be tolerated, the *idolothyta* being forbidden because (as Paul himself insists when they are partaken of with "conscience of the idol") such food belongs to the worship of "dead gods."

But this obsolescence of the decree is by no means the whole truth, nor does it fully explain why the 'Western' reviser should venture on so radical an alteration of the text. We must also take account of the fact that Luke himself encounters a difference of view in the sources he blends together. The Caesarean-Petrine source of 9, 32-11, 18 is certainly later, because in it Peter is divinely bidden to ignore his Jewish scruples about "pollution" by food. The earlier, Antiochian, pseudopauline source of chapter 15 holds these same scruples vitally important. This conflict of two contradictory principles in the sources, and Luke's imperfect adjustment of the two, is also in part responsible for the 'Western' rewriting of the decree. The higher critic must begin with this Lukan maladjustment if he would present a single and truly adequate solution for the whole series of exegetical difficulties in the middle chapters of Acts.

Luke's settlement of the third issue in the problem of universalization is the Jerusalem decree, a settlement ignored by Paul and in its basis inconsistent with Paul's principle that the converted Jew, having sought justification through simple faith in Christ, may not allow his desire to maintain in addition his Mosaic purity to debar him from table-fellowship with fellow Christians of gentile birth and practice (Gal. 2, 15 f.). The Lukan settlement, valid for Antioch and vicinity in Luke's time, in which food laws are imposed on gentile converts as "necessary" in order that "the Jews which are among the gentiles" may not incur "pollution," is certainly older and more authentic than that of the Caesarean-Petrine source, however contrary to Paul. For in the Caesarean-Petrine source the whole question is settled by direct divine intervention in

advance of the summons to Peter to go among gentiles, yes, even before he has been told of the mission on which he is to be sent. Moreover the settlement rests on far more sweeping and universalistic grounds than in the Jerusalem decree. As in Mk. 7, 1-23 the entire fabric of "distinctions of meats" is swept away by divine authority; and Peter is simply bidden to suppress his man-made scruples.

We shall see presently by what harmonistic theory Luke attempts to adjust the two conflicting solutions. For the present we are concerned to show, first, that we actually have in Acts two inconsistent answers to this question, one given by the Jerusalem *conclave* at the instance of Peter and the delegates from Caesarea in Acts 10, 1-11, 18, the other by the Jerusalem *council* at the instance of the delegates from Antioch in Acts 15, 1-35; secondly, that the latter version, while to some extent exaggerated (after the manner of Luke in relating official assemblies), and undeniably contradictory to Paul in the attitude ascribed to him on the issue, is superior in age and authenticity to the Petrine, where immediate divine intervention gives Peter direction for every step of the way and removes all obstacles before him. It is conceivable that the story of the Jerusalem *council* might have been written within the lifetime of Paul, if the author were sufficiently remote from Paul's environment. To me it is not conceivable that any writer at all acquainted with Peter's real attitude in this great crisis should represent the settlement as effected in the manner alleged in the story of the Jerusalem *conclave*. I must assume that when the Caesarean-Petrine account was written both Peter and Paul had long since gone to their reward.

Harmonistic exegesis may find means to reconcile the two accounts, with or without aid from the 'Western' text. Critical exegesis cannot. The Jerusalem council described in Acts 15 reports how at the suggestion of James action was taken in behalf of the Jews of the dispersion, who in every city of the empire hear Moses read and expounded every Sabbath. They are to be encouraged and protected in their natural desire to keep the customs, circumcise their children, and preserve their ceremonial caste. If they are called upon to engage in table-

fellowship with fellow Christians of gentile birth, brethren not under any such restrictions as themselves, they will be contaminated in spite of themselves. James regards this (not without some reason) as an unfair interpretation of the agreement that gentile converts are exempt from the Mosaic distinctions of meats. In order, therefore, to protect the whole church from what he designates as the "pollutions of idols," he proposes that the gentile believers shall be told that it is "necessary" that they abstain from *idolothyta* and blood. Fornication is added, not so much because of its immorality, which leads Paul also to condemn it, as because this sin (as the Clementine writer assures us) differs from all others in that it defiles not only those who are guilty of it but also those "who eat and associate with them." The general assumption of the Jerusalem decree, basic for the whole proposal and assumed by Luke to have controlled the conduct of Paul and all other true apostles, is that converted Jews *must not be compelled* to disregard their caste-purity. They must be protected in it even if they have to insist on some slight restriction of gentile liberty. Of course we know that Paul directly denied this basic principle. Paul insisted that Jews as well as gentiles must rely solely on their faith in Christ for their salvation, and did his best at Antioch to compel Peter and the rest of the Jews to disregard "the customs." While willing to be all things to all men in ordinary intercourse so as to gain all, Paul went so far as to demand, when the issue was drawn at Antioch, that Peter, Barnabas, Mark, and "all the rest of the Jews," who had withdrawn from table-fellowship with gentile Christians, should ignore their ceremonial caste-purity and eat what was set before them. Luke, then, is in flat contradiction with Paul on the fundamental question whether a Jew may or may not stand out against the loss of his legal purity in this manner.

But Luke is equally in contradiction with the source he himself incorporates in 9, 32-11, 18. The story of the Jerusalem conclave begins and ends with the question of whether a Christian Jew may or may not insist on preserving his legal purity at the cost of refusing to eat with converted gentiles. And it is answered precisely as Paul would answer it. The

answer is, "No, he may not." But this answer is here given not by Paul, rebuking Peter and the delegates from James before the church at Antioch, but by Peter (!) after a special vision thrice repeated in preparation for his going among gentiles. Twice subsequently it is appealed to by Peter himself in justification of his conduct. In the Joppa vision the voice of God forbids Peter to cling to his legal purity. Peter, bidden to "rise, slay and eat" all manner of things forbidden by the law of Moses, protests: "Not so, Lord; for nothing common or unclean hath ever entered into my mouth." The Voice rebukes his presumption. These distinctions of meats are man-made; the food God sends, whether defiling or not according to Peter's previous ideas, must be regarded as pure in God's sight.

When Peter descends from the house-top and learns of the plea of Cornelius, he is able to make a partial application of the vision. Arrived at Cornelius' house he tells his experience and how it had taught him that "God is no respecter of persons, but in every nation he that feareth him and worketh righteousness is accepted by him." But this solves only the less difficult problem. The conduct of Jews among gentiles is still in question. Peter has still to face at Jerusalem the accusation of the brethren that were of the circumcision, "Thou wentest in to men uncircumcised and didst eat with them." Then Peter repeats a second time the story of his protest against even a voice from heaven urging him to disregard his legal purity, and how God himself commanded the setting of it aside. According to this narrative even the opposing "brethren that were of the circumcision" at Jerusalem gave way before the direct command of God, and the whole church "glorified God, saying, Then to the gentiles also hath God granted repentance unto life." The vision is concerned with the question of a Jew among gentiles keeping or disregarding the Mosaic distinctions of meats. Certainly it would leave Peter small excuse for withdrawing from table-fellowship with them, as he actually did at Antioch, on the ground that his legal purity was too precious to him and must not be imperilled.

The 'Western' reading in Acts 15, 29 shows a change toward the principle championed in 9, 32-11, 18 of complete abolition

of the Jewish caste system. We are impelled by this most important and significant of all the 'Western' variants of Acts to the following conclusion. It is not enough to recognize with the leading textual critics that the 'moralization' of the Jerusalem decree took place early in the second century in consequence of the general breaking down of its impracticable rules for the protection of Jewish-Christian legal purity. We must also recognize a manifestation of this inevitable relaxation in the rapidly hellenizing church within the limits of Luke's own compilation. Luke incorporated in 9, 32-11, 18 a Petrine source which represents the settlement of the whole question both of the admission of gentiles and the conduct of Jewish Christians when brought into contact with them, specifically in the matter of distinctions of meats, as taking place at the Jerusalem conclave at the instance of Caesarea. This Caesarean source of Acts 9, 32-11, 18 already champions the gentile-Christian, or, as we should call it, 'liberal' view. The only way it could be harmonized, even imperfectly, with the earlier Antiochian source was to make the decision of the conclave a mere settlement *in principle*, the Antiochian settlement through Barnabas and Paul being made a *practical application* of what through Peter had been established *de jure*. The trouble with the harmonistic device is, of course, that the basic principle of settlement in the two cases is not the same. The Caesarean settlement, though put forward under the authority of Peter, represents the Pauline view, a view which through force of circumstances could not but prevail *ultimately* in the Greek-speaking church. It holds that the Jewish Christian has no right to claim special protection for his notions of legal purity when he goes among gentile Christians. The Antiochian settlement, which Luke (reported in reliable second-century tradition as a "native of Antioch") had every reason to adopt as authoritative, rests on the opposite principle, the view so impressively refuted by Paul in Gal. 2, 15-21, the view of the real, historical Peter, that the Jewish Christian has a right to withdraw from table-fellowship with his gentile-Christian brother if that is necessary in order to protect his own legal purity. Luke's harmonization of his two sources is obviously defective

at this point; 'Western' revisers removed the worst of the difficulty by the 'moralization' of the Jerusalem decree.

From this long 'higher-critical' explanation of the 'Western' variant in Acts 15, 29 we must return to the variant of 11, 1 f., because here not only is there no apparent exegetical difficulty in the immediate context, but the 'Western' addition creates one. It seems to be not so much the exegete who is here at a loss as the textual critic; for assimilation to the parallel in 15, 1 ff., seems hardly adequate as a motive for the long addition after *τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ*, even if we explain the Semitisms of what precedes as 'Western non-corrections,' to paraphrase the terminology of Hort.

However, if we look beyond the immediate context of 11, 1, even in the Alexandrian text, we shall find plenty of difficulties for the exegete also, and if the higher critic has a solution it will be all the better if it accounts for both.

The solution offered is stated in this form in the article in the Harvard Theological Review already referred to (p. 150, note 15):

Either the α text obtains a closer adjustment to the context by trimming off the protruding corner [the *plus* of the β text] . . . which still remained to resist a smooth bedding of the section [the Caesarean account of the settlement] in its new situation, or the β text shows consciousness of the duplication by imitating the parallels. Cf. 15, 2-3; 20, 17 ff.

The dilemma leaves it undecided whether the α -text or the β -text represents the writing of Luke, but in either case we have witness from the variant to the truth of the contention that the Caesarean account of the settlement of the issue of fellowship with gentiles is a misplaced doublet of the Antiochian. If we adopt the shorter reading, the longer will show that the 'Western' copyist perceived the parallelism and labored to enhance it. If we adopt the longer, it will show that some Alexandrian scribe perceived the contradiction to chapter 12 and sought to remove it by cancelling the latter half of verse 1, where it appears that Peter is not domiciled in Jerusalem. Either way the aid of the higher critic must be called in.

For the exegetical difficulty of the Caesarean account of the settlement, aggravated and exposed as it is by the 'Western'

addition in 11, 1, is by no means originated by it. The variant merely helps us see that the whole section from 9, 32 to 11, 18 is a doublet quite too large for the place Luke has given it. The fact that it overlaps the section which comes after in chapters 13-28 has already, I hope, been made clear. After Peter has been divinely taught that he must disregard his Jewish scruples about distinctions of meats when he goes among gentiles, and has silenced opposition and won the unanimous consent of the Jerusalem *conclave* to this doctrine, there is no more room, logically, for a Jerusalem *council* to settle the same question on the opposite principle, with stipulations guarding Jewish Christians from the "pollutions of idols" which they might incur through table-fellowship with their gentile brethren.

But the Caesarean account of the settlement likewise overlaps in the other direction. In chapters 6-8 the story of the "persecution that arose about Stephen" and the 'hellenistic dispersion' thereby occasioned winds up with an account in 8, 26-40 of how Philip, later called "the evangelist, one of the seven" (21, 8, part of the *we*-material), converted the eunuch of Ethiopia and subsequently evangelized the entire Philistine plain. Verse 40 avers that "passing through [from Azotus northward] he preached the gospel to all the cities till he came to Caesarea." As no reason appears why Philip should refuse to preach in Caesarea, and as the subsequent account of an actual companion of Paul, a fellow-guest with Paul of Philip in Caesarea, makes it apparent that Philip's house was at that time (55 A.D.) the headquarters of the church in that city, we naturally infer that Philip was in fact its founder. *But the story of 9, 32-11, 18 completely ignores Philip.* No one reading it without the other story would imagine for a moment any other than Peter as the sole founder of the church in Caesarea, and the first to proclaim Christ there among the gentiles. Thus the Caesarean account in Acts 9, 32-11, 18 of how Peter by divine direction first carried the gospel to the gentiles overlaps the preceding story of how Philip and "those that were scattered abroad in the persecution that arose about Stephen" had already carried it to the entire coastland from Philistine Ashdod to Caesarea. And this overlapping is quite as flagrant as that

of the sequel in chapters 13-28, with their belated account of how the Jerusalem council adjusted the already settled question of table-fellowship between converted Jews and converted gentiles.

The 'Western' addition to 11, 1 is not intended to correct this overlapping, even in the practical manner of the addition to 15, 29. The copyist does not appear to have been conscious of it. He rather aggravates the difficulty by enhancing the parallelism. What, then, does he contribute to the solution offered by the higher critic for the whole series of exegetical difficulties? He contributes this. If the motive for his addition is merely to enhance the parallelism, he thereby proves that the higher critic's perception of duplication is no illusion but a fact. If this motive is not sufficient, if it fails (as we incline to believe) to account for (1) the agreement of the supplement with the latent significance of the entire Caesarean account of Peter as leader in the evangelization of the gentile world and of Caesarea as its birthplace, and (2) for the strongly Semitic coloration of the language as 'rewritten' in the β -text, then we must fall back upon the shrewd suggestion of Hort, that uncanonical sources paralleling the story at this point were still in circulation at this very early period, and have affected the 'Western' text. Only, we have no need to assume (as Hort appears to do) that the scribe actually copied from some such document as the *Kerygma Petri* (dated by von Dobschütz ca. 90 A.D.), using the very words employed in it. We may adopt Ropes's explanation of the stronger Semitic coloration of the language in the 'Western' text of 11, 1 and 14, 3 as due to 'Western non-correction,' that is, as the retention of the original Lukan text where Alexandrian transcribers have corrected it. But for the substantial content of the supplement we shall require something more than the vague notion of assimilation to 15, 1 ff. We shall be obliged to admit that the 'Western' copyist instinctively grasped the real intention of the source, just as he has done in the substitution of *Ἑλληνιστάς* for *Ἕλληνας* in 11, 20. The reason is that he was saturated with current representations of Peter as the great Syrian apostle to the gentiles; for in his time the fame of Peter as an evan-

gelist had already quite eclipsed that of mere hellenistic propagandists such as Philip and Paul. The 'Western' copyist "caught the idea" of the Caesarean-Petrine source because it was the current idea of his times, however contradictory to the statements of Paul and however inconsistent with Luke's own adjustment of the conflicting claims of his two principal sources. Of course this implies that it is the Caesarean-Petrine source which is the late one, nearest the period of the 'Western' revision.

As was pointed out above, the only possible adjustment open to Luke, if he wished to avail himself of both narratives, was to treat the work ascribed to Peter in the Caesarean source as merely a precedent *de jure*, established by the conclave of 11, 1-18, while he reduced that ascribed to Barnabas and Saul in the Antiochian source to a settlement *de facto*. To accomplish this it was necessary to make the work of the Antiochian missionaries in 13, 1 ff. follow as the sequel to the 'dispersion of the Twelve' in chapter 12, rather than to leave there 9, 32-11, 18, the mission work of Peter, to which chapter 12 really and intrinsically leads up. To avoid intolerable duplication, the mission-work of Peter, which in the Caesarean source followed the account of the persecutor's fate (12, 20-24) after the analogy of chapter 8 as sequel to chapters 6-7, had to be thrown back and made to follow the account of the persecution inaugurated by the Pharisees and Saul in 6, 8-9, 31. The transposition doubtless required some minor touches also, such as the cancellation of material like that which the 'Western' text supplies after 11, 1, with other too patent doublets. The marvel is that so much remains untouched to attest the real intention of the source. Thus Luke retains the Caesarean treatment of the whole question of the duty of the Jew among gentiles to maintain legal purity, notwithstanding its conflict with the Antiochian source. On this point, as we have seen, the 'Western' copyist has sought to maintain the spirit of Luke himself, removing so far as he could the remaining evidences of overlapping by moralizing the Jerusalem Decree. But as regards the more important adjustment effected by Luke through transposition of the mission-work of Peter to a place

after the 'hellenistic dispersion' instead of after the 'Apostolic,' our 'Western' transcriber has worked in the opposite sense, putting himself on the side of the source, as in 11, 20, rather than on the side of Luke. We can best account for his doing so by his saturation with post-apostolic ideas of Peter as the great apostle to the gentiles of Syria.

The motive of Luke for inverting the order of 12, 1-24 and 9, 32-11, 18 has already been sufficiently dealt with. Corroboration of the fact must be looked for in the exegetical difficulties encountered in the Caesarean-Petrine story of the founding of gentile Christianity at Caesarea and its vindication at the Jerusalem conclave in its present order. Some of the indications that Acts 9, 32-11, 18 is a block "too big for its setting" have already been spoken of. It remains in closing to state with greater accuracy a minor consideration urged in my article 'More Philological Criticism of Acts,' in the *American Journal of Theology*, XXII, 1918.

In this article (p. 9, note 1) the statement is made that the compiler of Acts is responsible for the transposition of the two blocks 9, 32-11, 18 and 12, 1-23 as they stood in the source. In support of this it is maintained among other arguments that "the rule of the procurators, with its 'Italic Cohort' stationed in Caesarea, did not begin till after the death of Agrippa." Against so loose a statement of a long-debated issue the sharp reply of Torrey in his article 'Fact and Fancy in Theories Concerning Acts' (*American Journal of Theology*, XXIII, 1919, pp. 61-86 and 189-212) was perhaps deserved. The situation reflected in Acts 10, 1 ff. does indeed presuppose "the rule of the procurators" after the death of Agrippa rather than the conditions of his reign or earlier. Nevertheless it was reprehensible on my part not to make clear that the question does not concern the five cohorts of auxiliary troops stationed from long before in Caesarea, together with an ala of cavalry, Syrians by birth, recruited from Sebaste (Samaria) and Caesarea, violent sympathizers with the pro-hellenistic party, and hence as hostile as they dared to be to the pro-jewish tendencies and policy of Agrippa. The presence of these "Syrian" auxiliaries in Caesarea both during and after the reign of Agrippa

was a continual source of irritation to the pro-jewish element, much as the British troops in occupation in Ireland until recently, many of them recruits from Belfast and Londonderry, were to the Irish. On the death (May [?] 44) of the pro-jewish king Agrippa I, darling of Josephus and the Pharisees because of his unfailing devotion to the law and his harping on his Jewish descent, these "Syrian" troops broke out in most unseemly rejoicing. The Jewish party sent a delegation to Claudius asking the transfer of the whole garrison to Pontus, and the substitution of an equal number of troops drawn from the Roman legions stationed in Syria. Claudius lent a complaisant ear (it being part of the imperial policy so far as possible to substitute Roman for native troops in such situations), and at first agreed to the plan; at least the delegates were so convinced. But the "Syrian" troops also claimed a hearing, regarding it as a great hardship to be exiled indefinitely from their homes and families, and secured at least a mitigation of the emperor's intended punishment. Josephus is bitterly disappointed at the outcome, and ascribes the later outbreaks between "Syrians" and Jews which culminated in the great rebellion of 67-70 to the fact that the garrison of Caesarea still continued then "for the most part" Syrian (τὸ γὰρ πλεόν Ῥωμαίοις τῆς ἐκεῖ δυνάμεως ἐκ Συρίας ἦν κατειλεγμένον). It is very noteworthy that his strong disposition to curry favor with his Roman patrons does not induce him to make any exception to his indictment of the garrison as a whole in Agrippa's time. If one of the five cohorts consisted of well-disposed Roman troops, commanded by officers one of whom at least was endeared to the Jews by his regard for their religion and his favors to their race, Josephus does not mention it. It is only regarding the garrison as it was constituted later, in Felix's time, that he makes exception in favor of a *minority* of the garrison and (specifically) its "officers."

But it is positively known from inscriptions that Claudius did not wholly recede from his original purpose, or else that, if he did, it was put in force by his successors. The garrison was maintained down to Vespasian's time at its original strength of five cohorts (with the ala of cavalry), but at some time before

the outbreak of the great war it had apparently come to include in its total at least one *cohors Italica civium Romanorum voluntariorum*.⁷ This accounts, therefore, for the representation of Acts 10, 1 ff., as well as for the difference between the two statements of Josephus, one (relating to conditions under Agrippa and earlier) in which the entire garrison is accused of pro-syrian activities, the other (relating to conditions in the period of Felix) in which he accuses only the majority, expressly excepting the "officers." The only question, therefore, that remains between Torrey and myself concerns the date of arrival of these "Roman" troops, highly acceptable of course to the pro-jewish party because they represented a partial consent to their petition. According to Torrey these "Roman" troops had been in Caesarea continuously from long before Agrippa's reign, because the five cohorts were still "the same" in the earlier as in the later period. But Josephus does not say that the cohorts remained 'the same.' He only says that the Syrian troops were permitted to remain in spite of their misconduct in

⁷ Schürer, *Geschichte des Jüdischen Volkes*, 3rd ed., I, pp. 462 f., cites three inscriptions from Mommsen (*Ephemeris epigr.* V, p. 249): "*Coh. I Italica civium Romanorum voluntariorum*" (C.I.L. XIV, 171); "*Cohors miliaria Italica voluntariorum quae est in Syria*" (C.I.L. XI, 6117); "*Coh. II Italica*" (C.I.L. VI, 3528). He also points to the interchange in Arrian ("*Acies contra Alonas*," in *Arriani Scripta Minora*, ed. Hercher) of ἡ σπειρα ἡ Ἰταλική with οἱ Ἰταλοί as indicating (together with the inscription first cited) that a *cohors Italica* consisted of Roman citizens from Italy. However, the inscription on which dependence is placed for dating the arrival of this cohort in Syria before 69 A.D. is the epitaph of a soldier buried at Carnuntum on the Danube at that date, belonging to such a *Cohors Italica II*, and himself apparently a native of Philadelphia in Decapolis, a Roman colonia. This Roman citizen accordingly was also a "Syrian," though it is reasonable to suppose that the traditions and temper of a cohort so named would be more like those of the legionaries whom the Jews of Caesarea had desired to bring thither than those of the "Syrian" auxiliaries whom they detested. The whole subject is obscure and difficult, but the judgement of impartial historians is likely to support Schürer rather than Ramsay in the interchange in *The Expositor* for September and December 1896, in which the bearing of the inscriptions on our problem is discussed. From the second of those above cited it appears that a *Cohors Italica* was stationed in Syria. From the Carnuntum inscription its arrival in Syria (where the recruit from Philadelphia probably enlisted) must be dated before 69. From its self-designation in the inscriptions and from the reference in Arrian we must infer that the character of the regiment and its officers would be such as the Jewish petitioners from Caesarea desired; and from the difference between the two references of Josephus in *Ant.* xix. 9, 2 and *War* lii. 13, 7 that its arrival there was after the death of Agrippa.

the summer of 44, and that the number of cohorts in Vespasian's time still continued to be five. This, perhaps, would not be considered a serious mistake in the use of our principal evidence, but at least we may wish that Torrey's statement had shown that an alternative exists to the assumption that the cohorts Italica was one of the five obnoxious "Syrian" cohorts of Agrippa's time.

Torrey's conjecture, on the other hand, based on the statement of Josephus (Ant. xx. 6, 1) that Cumanus in 52 A.D. took only four cohorts of infantry (from Caesarea?) and one troop of cavalry from Samaria to suppress the Jewish attack on the Samaritans, is both reasonable and helpful (to Torrey's opponents) as throwing light on the date of coming of the cohorts Italica. "It is at least a reasonable supposition," says Torrey, "that the remaining cohort was the *σπεῖρα Ἰταλική* of Acts 10, 1, and that it was deemed politic to keep Cornelius and his Italian soldiers out of these local quarrels as far as practicable." True, but if it be reasonable to infer the presence of the cohorts Italica from Ant. xx. 6, 1, why is it not equally reasonable to infer from the difference between the statement of Ant. xix. 9, 2 that *all* the garrison in Caesarea in Agrippa's time consisted of Syrians, and the statement of War, ii. 13, 7 that in the time of Felix (!) the *majority* were still Syrian, that the date of the arrival of the cohorts Italica was between the death of Agrippa in 44 and the recall of Felix in 57-58? The present writer confesses ignorance of whether or not Roman practice permitted the consolidation of five depleted cohorts of auxiliaries into four. If it did, there is no obstacle to our supposing that after the serious troubles suppressed by Cuspius Fadus in 46 the five depleted Syrian cohorts of the garrison of Caesarea were consolidated into four, and reinforced by a cohorts Italica *civium Romanorum voluntariorum* of which the inscriptions tell.

If this 'Italian' contingent was present, as Torrey conjectures, as early as before the reign of Agrippa, it will be difficult to reconcile the conflicting statements of Josephus. Schürer maintains, with the support of many others, that the mention of a cohorts Italica in Caesarea, with officers of the type of

Cornelius, well-disposed toward the Jews, favoring the Jewish religion, and greatly beloved for benefactions to "the people," is an anachronism in the period of Agrippa or earlier, and that we can only account for its appearance in Acts 10, 1 ff. on the supposition that in this passage "the circumstances of a later period have been transferred back to an earlier." The present writer holds the compiler of Acts responsible for this transfer. By restoring the order of the Caesarean-Petrine source, so as to let Acts 12, 1-23 be followed by 9, 32-11, 18, the representations of Acts, of the inscriptions, and of both statements of Josephus regarding the disorders stirred up by the Syrian auxiliaries, all come into harmony. The motive for Luke's transposition has already been explained.

It is regrettable that brevity in stating an argument by no means new, aggravated by looseness of expression, should have made the present restatement needful. On the other hand, higher critics, who still maintain against Torrey that the statement of Acts 10, 1 ff. "must rest on some misunderstanding" (Preuschen), will be grateful for a well-founded conjecture leading to a date, not before, but shortly after the death of Agrippa, as that of the coming of Cornelius and the cohort Italica to Caesarea.

It has been shown on grounds which (whether or not deserving the designation 'historico-critical') are not due to "fancy" ('Western' corrections prove this), and which cannot be dismissed as 'theological,' that the Caesarean-Petrine account of gentile evangelization in Acts 9, 32-11, 18 overlaps and conflicts with the Antiochian-Pauline of Acts 6-8 and 13-28. It has also been shown that a single working hypothesis of the higher criticism, Luke's adjustment of his two main sources in the transposition above-described, covers all the principal phenomena to be explained, showing both why the rewriting of a series of passages in this section by 'Western' revisers was felt to be necessary, and also making apparent the origin of the exegetical difficulties which occasioned the changes. Torrey's view to the contrary notwithstanding, the supposition is neither unreasonable nor unexampled. We are not

speaking of mere translators or transcribers, among whom such "manipulation of documents" may have been regarded as neither "usual nor respectable." We are speaking of an author engaged in the task of reducing to unity the more or less conflicting accounts of those who before him had undertaken to draw up narratives of the extension of the gospel to the gentiles. We will not cite parallels from the narrative books of the Old Testament, because Luke's method of compilation was certainly less mechanical. Parallels drawn from the Gospel of Peter or the Diatessaron of Tatian would be open to similar objection. We will restrict ourselves to three examples from Luke's own practice. Against these surely no such objection can lie.

(1) In the Temptation story (Lk. 4, 1-13; cf. Matt. 4, 1-11) Luke has, in the judgement of most critics, transposed the order of the second and third temptations in order to secure a better geographical sequence. Others may prefer to think Luke's the original order here. If so, that merely transfers the responsibility for the "manipulation" to Matthew's shoulders, and Matthew's transpositions of Mark, if not "respectable," are certainly not unusual.

(2) In transcribing the account of the saying of Jesus regarding spiritual kin in Mk. 3, 31-35; cf. Lk. 8, 19-21.⁸ Luke transposes the incident from before the section on teaching in parables (Mk. 4, 1-25; cf. Lk. 8, 4-18) to a position immediately after.

(3) In repeating the story of the rejection at Nazareth (Mk. 6, 1-6) in another form, Luke in 4, 16-30 transposes it from a place after the "mighty works done in Capernaum" to a place immediately before the narration of these, notwithstanding the fact that the story itself refers to them as having already occurred. The motive for this transposition is generally taken to be to give a typical instance, at the very outset of the ministry, of rejection by those having a first claim with consequent turning to others. Whatever the motive, Luke remains responsible for this "manipulation" of his sources.

⁸ Another version, probably from the Second Source, appears in Lk. 11, 27 f.

The supposition of Luke's adjustment of two conflicting sources in Acts 6-8; 11, 19-30; 13, 1 ff. and 12, 1-24; 9, 32-11, 18 by transposition of two sections of the later of the two, so as to make Peter's evangelization of gentiles go before Paul's and serve as an apostolic precedent, is therefore neither unreasonable in itself nor lacking in parallels from Luke's own work. Explaining, as it seems to do, the phenomena otherwise inexplicable in the central chapters of Acts, whether of textual criticism or of exegesis, it commends itself to acceptance by discriminating and unprejudiced minds.

THE APOSTLES IN THE NEW TESTAMENT AND IN THE ECCLESIASTICAL TRADITION OF EGYPT

WILLIAM H. P. HATCH

EPISCOPAL THEOLOGICAL SCHOOL, CAMBRIDGE, MASSACHUSETTS

THERE are four lists of the Apostles in the New Testament — one in each of the Synoptic Gospels containing the names of the Twelve, and one in the Book of Acts giving those of the Eleven only.¹ Each list differs from the others in some respects.

Peter naturally stands first in each of the New Testament lists, and Judas Iscariot comes last when he is mentioned at all. The one occupies the position of honor at the head of the series; the other is named at the end on account of his treachery. The two sons of Zebedee, with Andrew and Philip, all being prominent members of the apostolic company and early disciples of Jesus,² form together with Peter the first five in each of these lists. Below this point there is considerable difference in order and some variation in the names of the Apostles.

Matthew's list is based on that of Mark, but Luke's is probably derived from his special source. This is a debatable question and scholars are divided on it;³ discussion of it lies beyond the limits of the present article.

Matthew differs from Mark and Luke in arranging the names in pairs. This was probably suggested by Mark's statement that the Twelve were sent forth two by two,⁴ although neither Matthew nor Luke says that the Apostles went on their mission in companies of two. There may also have been a feeling in Palestine that the grouping of the names of teachers by two's

¹ Mark 3, 16-19; Matt. 10, 2-4; Luke 6, 14-16; Acts 1, 13.

² Mark 1, 16 ff. = Matt. 4, 18 ff.; John 1, 44.

³ B. Weiss assigns Luke 6, 14-16 to L (*Texte und Untersuchungen*, Dritte Reihe, vol. II, 3, p. 110), and Streeter thinks that these verses were part of Proto-Luke (*The Four Gospels*, p. 222). On the other hand, J. Weiss believes that Luke is based on Mark at this point (*Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments*, 2nd ed., I, p. 443).

⁴ Mark 6, 7.

was normal, for in Jewish tradition the masters who transmitted learning during the interval between the death of Antigonus of Šoko and the beginning of the Tannaite period were arranged in pairs. Hillel and Shammai were the most famous of them.⁵

The list of the Apostles in Acts, which naturally contains only eleven names, was probably taken from an Aramaic source, and is undoubtedly of Palestinian or Syrian origin; but the Apostles are not here arranged in pairs. Thaddaeus is omitted in Luke and Acts, and Judas the son of James is added.

Since, in the extra-canonical lists of the Apostles which we are about to examine, Peter and Cephas are regarded as different persons, it will be expedient to consider first the origin and diffusion of this view in Christian literature.

Clement of Alexandria thought that the Cephas mentioned in Galatians 2, 11 was not Peter, but rather one of the seventy disciples who happened to have the same name as the Apostle Peter.⁶ He might have drawn the same conclusion from what Paul says in 1 Corinthians 15, 5 about the appearance of Jesus after the resurrection first to Cephas and then to the Twelve;⁷ but Paul's censure of Cephas in Galatians 2, 11 ff. could not fail to give offence to some and to raise the question of the identity of Cephas.

Origen wrote voluminously on the Pauline epistles; and on Galatians, according to Jerome, he composed commentaries, homilies, and notes.⁸ Since, however, with the exception of a

⁵ Cf. Pirke Aboth i. 4 ff.

⁶ Cf. Eusebius, H. E. i. 12, 2. Clement expressed this opinion in the fifth book of his Hypotyposes. See also Casaubon in *Critici Sacri*, VII, col. 3309; Cornelius à Lapide on Gal. 2, 11; Hilgenfeld, *Novum Testamentum extra Canonem Receptum*, IV, p. 105; Harnack, *Die Chronologie der altchristlichen Litteratur*, II, p. 486; and Lake in the *Harvard Theological Review*, XIV, p. 96.

⁷ See also 1 Cor. 9, 5.

⁸ In the prologue to his commentary on Galatians Jerome writes thus (Migne, P. L. 26, col. 333): "Scripsit enim ille vir in epistolam Pauli ad Galatas quinque proprie volumina [commentaries], et decimum Stromatum suorum librum commatico super explanatione eius sermone complevit: tractatus [homilies] quoque varios et excerpta [notes], quae vel sola possint sufficere, composuit." The list of Origen's works given in Jerome's Ep. xxxiii ad Paulam mentions a commentary in 15 books and 7 homilies on Galatians. See Klostermann's critical text in *Sitzungsberichte*, Berlin Academy, 1897, pp. 865 and 869. But a tenth-century MS. of the Acts and Epistles at Mt. Athos (Laura 184 B 64 = Gregory 1739), in which the commentary of Origen on Gala-

few fragments Origen's writings on Galatians have perished, we cannot say positively whether he was acquainted with the view in question or not. But inasmuch as Clement, his teacher and predecessor in the catechetical school in Alexandria, held it, and published it in his Hypotyposes, it seems altogether probable that Origen knew about it. However, it is not found among those comments on Galatians in Cramer's Catenae (vol. VI), which, though none of them actually bears Origen's name, have been suspected to be at least in part from his hand.⁹ So, too, this opinion does not appear in the Latin version of the commentary of Theodore of Mopsuestia.¹⁰

Nevertheless it was not completely lost in the exegetical tradition of the Greek church; for it is mentioned by 'Oecumenius' and by Theophylact, and they both cite Eusebius as their authority for it. 'Oecumenius' gives it as an alternative view and remarks that it is plausible (*πιθανός*);¹¹ but Theophylact flatly rejects it.¹²

Chrysostom says that some (*τινες*) resolved the question raised by the incident narrated in Galatians 2, 11 ff. by asserting that the one who was rebuked by Paul at Antioch was not Peter, "the first of the Apostles," but some person of inferior standing.¹³ He does not give the names of those who held this opinion, nor does he say that this person was one of the seventy disciples. Chrysostom himself held that it was the Apostle Peter.

tians is divided into five books (cf. von der Goltz in *Texte und Untersuchungen*, Neue Folge, vol. II, 4, pp. 72 f.) confirms Jerome's statement in his prologue as to the number of books in the commentary.

⁹ See Turner in *Hastings's Dict. of the Bible*, extra vol., p. 493.

¹⁰ I have consulted all the extant commentaries on Galatians mentioned by Dr. Turner in his most useful article on 'Greek Patristic Commentaries on the Pauline Epistles' in *Hastings*, extra vol., pp. 484-531, but have found no trace of this view in any of them.

¹¹ Migne, P. G. 118, col. 1112. There has been transmitted under the name of Oecumenius not only the genuine exegetical work of this writer, but also much additional matter of later date. Oecumenius lived in the sixth century, and the compilation which bears his name was made in the ninth. It contains the commentary of Photius on the Pauline epistles. Cf. Staab, *Die Pauluskatenen*, pp. 270 and 273 f.

¹² Migne, P. G. 124, col. 977.

¹³ Migne, P. G. 51, col. 383 ff. The person who was censured is described as *ἐτερός τις εὐτελής καὶ ἀπερριμμένος καὶ τῶν πολλῶν εἰς*. According to the editions both of Montfaucon and of Savile, Chrysostom read *Πέτρος*, not *Κηφᾶς*, in Gal. 2, 11.

The idea that it was Cephas, one of the seventy disciples, and not the Apostle Peter who was censured by Paul is found also in the Syriac-speaking church. Isho'dad, the Nestorian bishop, who flourished about 850 A.D., mentions this opinion in his commentary on Galatians, but does not say who held it. He himself rejects it as erroneous, and maintains that Cephas is Peter, "the chief of the disciples."¹⁴

Solomon of Bâsrâ in 'Irâq, a Nestorian metropolitan of the thirteenth century, includes Cephas in a list of the seventy disciples, and adds that he preached in Antioch.¹⁵ In the preceding chapter he is spoken of as "Cephas, whom Paul mentions."¹⁶ Solomon betrays no knowledge of the fact that Peter was called Cephas, and he doubtless thought that the 'disciple' Cephas was referred to in Galatians 2, 11 ff.¹⁷

The idea that Cephas was one of the seventy disciples mentioned by Luke is found in both Greek and Syriac sources.¹⁸ Most of the men whose names occur in the New Testament apart from the twelve Apostles were regarded in Christian tradition as members of the larger group sent out by Jesus to preach the gospel and heal the sick. Mark and Luke were also included in it. But we are not directly concerned with this question, and it is only mentioned here in passing.

The idea that the Cephas who was reproved by Paul at Antioch was not the Apostle Peter, but rather one of the seventy disciples, was known in the West; but apparently it was not held by any representative writer of the Latin-speaking church during the first six centuries. For example, Tertullian says expressly that Paul "censured Peter for not walking straightforwardly according to the truth of the gospel."¹⁹ This was indeed the view generally held. Jerome is the only

¹⁴ Cf. Isho'dad, Comm. (ed. Gibson in *Horae Semiticae*, xi, vol. V, pt. i, p. 89, ll. 12 ff.; Eng. transl., xi, vol. V, pt. ii, p. 59).

¹⁵ Deburithâ 49 (ed. Budge in *Anecdota Oxoniensia, Semitic Series*, I, pt. ii, p. 128, ll. 8 f.; Eng. transl., p. 113).

¹⁶ Ibid. 48 (ed. Budge, p. 125, ll. 3 f.; Eng. transl., p. 110).

¹⁷ The Peshitta reads 'Cephas' in Gal. 2, 11.

¹⁸ Cf. Ps.-Dorotheus of Tyre in *Chronicon Paschale* (ed. Dindorf in *Corpus Scriptorum Historiae Byzantinae*), II, p. 126. The *Σύγγραμμα ἐκκλησιαστικόν περὶ τῶν οὐ μαθητῶν τοῦ κυρίου*, which is attributed to Dorotheus of Tyre, is a late Byzantine work.

¹⁹ Adv. Marc. v. 3. See also Adv. Marc. i. 20 and De praescript. haeret. 23.

one of the early Latin commentators who records the other opinion.²⁰ He mentions no names in connection with it, but he probably found it in some Greek writer. He himself rejected it.²¹

One reason why this notion gained little or no currency in the West during the first four centuries was that the Old Latin text had 'Peter' and not 'Cephas' in Galatians 2, 11. For 'Peter' the Vulgate substituted 'Cephas,' which is the Old Uncial reading in Greek. Victorinus, 'Ambrosiaster,' Augustine, and Pelagius all used the Old Latin text in one form or another, and even Jerome in his commentary on Galatians employed a biblical text that is intermediate between the Old Latin and the Vulgate.²² The Old Latin 'Petrus' is preserved in the lemmata of the commentaries of Victorinus, 'Ambrosiaster,' and Jerome at this place. It is probable that Augustine also read 'Petrus' here, because this is the reading of the fragmentary Freising ms., which represents the type of text used by him from the year 389 onwards.²³ Pelagius, too, as has just been said, read the New Testament in the Old Latin version; but a Vulgate text has been substituted for the original Old Latin in the lemmata of his commentaries.²⁴

The last Latin writer to be considered is Gregory the Great, with whom our study of this erroneous idea in the West may fittingly end. Gregory relates that some held that it was not Peter, the chief of the Apostles, but another of that name who was censured by Paul; but he declares that if these persons had read Paul's words more carefully, they would not make that statement.²⁵ He mentions no names in connection with this opinion.

²⁰ I have examined, besides Jerome, the commentaries of Victorinus, 'Ambrosiaster,' Augustine, and Pelagius.

²¹ In Gal. 2, 11 (Migne, P. L. 26, col. 365 ff.). His words are: "Alterius nescio cuius Cephae nescire nos nomen nisi eius qui et in evangelio, et in aliis Pauli epistolis, et in hac quoque ipsa modo Cephas, modo Petrus, scribitur."

²² Cf. Souter, *The Earliest Latin Commentaries on the Epistles of St. Paul*, pp. 105 f.

²³ Souter, pp. 147 ff.

²⁴ Souter, pp. 213 ff.

²⁵ Cf. Migne, P. L. 76, col. 1003. It is worthy of note that Gregory read 'Petrus' and not 'Cephas' in Gal. 2, 11.

We now turn to certain extra-canonical lists of the Apostles which had their origin in Egypt. They are unlike the New Testament lists in several respects, but they are of course secondary to the latter and have no independent value as sources of knowledge concerning the Twelve. Nevertheless they throw light on the way in which the Apostles were regarded in Egypt at a comparatively early date and for several centuries afterwards.

The earliest of the documents we are about to consider is the 'Epistula Apostolorum,' which only recently became known to scholars.²⁶ According to Carl Schmidt the Greek original of this work was written in Asia Minor in the second half of the second century, probably in the decade 160-170.²⁷ On the other hand Bardy and Vitti are much more likely to be right in thinking that the Epistula is of Egyptian origin.²⁸ It must have been composed before the year 180, for it contains a promise of Christ that the parousia would take place, between Pentecost and Passover, when one hundred and fifty years should have passed.²⁹ This period of a century and a half begins with the resurrection, and after its expiration no one would have predicted the Lord's return in this particular form.

The original of the Epistula Apostolorum has perished, but the tractate is extant in an Ethiopic and a Sahidic version, and

²⁶ The Sahidic text was discovered by Carl Schmidt in 1895. It is contained in a papyrus of the 4th or 5th century which is at the Mission Archéologique Française in Cairo. The text, with a German translation, appeared in 1919 (*Texte und Untersuchungen*, Dritte Reihe, XIII). Guerrier published the Ethiopic version, with a French translation, in 1913, chiefly on the basis of a manuscript in the British Museum (Or. 793), which was written in the middle of the 18th century (*Patrologia Orientalis*, IX, 3). The scanty remains of a Latin version were recognized by Bick in a palimpsest now in Vienna but formerly of Bobbio (*Codex Palatinus Vindobonensis* 16), which is of the 5th or 6th century (*Sitzungsberichte*, Vienna Academy, 159, Abteil. 7).

²⁷ *Texte und Untersuchungen*, Dritte Reihe, XIII, pp. 361 ff.

²⁸ Bardy in *Revue Biblique*, 1921, pp. 130 f.; and Vitti in *Verbum Domini*, III, p. 373.

²⁹ Epist. Apost. 17. According to the Coptic text 120 years were to elapse before the parousia. This would make A.D. 150 the terminus ante quem for the composition of the Epistula Apostolorum. But the Ethiopic version has 150 years, and this number seems more likely to be right. Cf. Schmidt, pp. 397 f. The Latin translation is preserved at this point, but unfortunately the numeral is illegible. Bardy (pp. 131 f.) grants that the document may have been written in the second century, but on general grounds prefers to place it in the third.

of a Latin translation a single leaf has survived. However, it is complete only in the Ethiopic form. This version may have been made directly from the Sahidic, or it may have been based upon a now lost Arabic translation. In the Sahidic text six sections are lacking at the beginning and three at the end, and there are three lacunae in the body of the document.

In section 2 of the Ethiopic version, which is unfortunately lacking in the Sahidic text, there is a list of the Apostles containing eleven names. John stands first, and after him come Thomas, Peter, Andrew, James, and Philip. All of these except James are prominent in the Fourth Gospel. Moreover, Nathanael is reckoned among the Apostles; but he is not believed to be the same as Bartholomew,³⁰ who is also mentioned. James the son of Alphaeus, and Thaddaeus, as well as Judas Iscariot, are omitted. Neither Simon Zelotes nor Judas the son of James appears; but "Judas Zelotes," a conflate figure made up of these two, occupies the tenth place.

The list of the Apostles given in section 2 of the Ethiopic version ends with Cephas, who, as in some other sources, is here treated as distinct from Peter. This view of Peter and Cephas is peculiarly Egyptian, and it leads one to believe that the *Epistula Apostolorum* was written in Egypt rather than in Asia Minor. Peter and Cephas are expressly identified in the Fourth Gospel,³¹ and a Christian writer of Asia Minor could hardly have ignored or departed from so well established a tradition. If, however, as Schmidt maintains, the original

³⁰ For the identification of Nathanael and Bartholomew see Meyer's Commentary on John 1, 46. Most commentators adopt this view, but they do not refer to any ancient writers who held it. It is, however, found in some Syriac works. Cf. Isho'dad, Comm. (ed. Gibson in *Horae Semiticae*, VII, p. 123, l. 2); Solomon of Bâsrâ, *Deburithâ* 50 (ed. Budge, p. 130, ll. 5 f.); and Bar-Salibi, Comm. in *Evangelia* (in *Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium, Scriptorum Syri, Series secunda*, tom. xcvi, fasc. 2, p. 282, l. 20). In the *Menaea* of the Greek Church Nathanael is said to be the same as Simon Zelotes of Cana in Galilee. Cf. Cornelius à Lapide on John 1, 45. This identification is based on the fact that Cana was the home of Nathanael (John 21, 2) and that Simon is called *ὁ Καναναῖος* (which was understood to mean 'of Cana') in Mark 3, 18 and Matthew 10, 4. Hilgenfeld formerly regarded Nathanael as identical with Matthew (Das Evangelium und die Briefe Johannis, pp. 271 f.), but later he identified him with Matthias (*Novum Testamentum extra Canonem Receptum*, IV, p. 105).

³¹ John 1, 43.

work was a product of Asia Minor, it is impossible to believe that it is faithfully represented by the Ethiopic version at this point.

Neither Cephas nor Peter is called Simon in the *Epistula Apostolorum*, despite what is said by each one of the Synoptists and by the Fourth Evangelist.³² The only Simon mentioned in the work is the sorcerer of Samaria who sought to obtain for money the Apostles' power to confer the Holy Spirit.³³ He and Cerinthus are associated together as active enemies of Christ.³⁴

In the *Epistula Apostolorum* the Apostles are not thought of primarily as individuals, but rather as an official body. Their personal qualities and characteristics have given place to their authority as a sacred college.

The document which we shall next examine belongs to the literature of church law. It is the so-called 'Apostolic Church Order,' written in Egypt some time between the years 250 and 350, and probably in the second half of this period,³⁵ and extant both in the Greek original and in Syriac, Coptic (Bohairic and Sahidic), Arabic, and Ethiopic translations.³⁶ Moreover, the remains of a Latin version prove that it was known in the West as well as the East.³⁷ It is probably the work to which Rufinus of Aquileia refers under the title of 'Duae Viae vel Iudicium Petri.'³⁸

³² Mark 3, 16; Matt. 10, 2; 16, 17 f.; Luke 6, 14; John 1, 42.

³³ Acts 8, 9 ff.

³⁴ *Epist. Apost.* 7. This passage is preserved in the Sahidic as well as in the Ethiopic text.

³⁵ Harnack, *Chronologie*, II, pp. 485 f. See also *Texte und Untersuchungen*, II, 1 and 2, pp. 218 ff.

³⁶ For the Greek text see Hilgenfeld, *Novum Testamentum extra Canonem Receptum*, IV, pp. 95 ff.; and Harnack in *Texte und Untersuchungen*, II, 1 and 2, pp. 225 ff. The Syriac version has been published by Arendzen in the *Journal of Theological Studies*, III, pp. 59 ff., and the Bohairic by Tattam (*The Apostolical Constitutions*, London, 1848). The Sahidic translation was edited by Lagarde in *Aegyptiaca* (Göttingen, 1883), pp. 239 ff. The Ethiopic and Arabic versions can be found in Horner, *The Statutes of the Apostles* (London, 1904), pp. 1 ff. and 89 ff.

³⁷ Hauler, *Didascaliae Apostolorum Fragmenta Veronensia Latina* (Leipzig, 1900), I, pp. 92 ff. The prooemion, which contains the list of the Apostles, is not preserved in Latin.

³⁸ *Comm. in symb. apost.* 38. Jerome also mentions a 'Iudicium' among the writings ascribed to Peter (*De viris ill.* 1). Eusebius, however, says nothing about such a work in *H. E.* iii. 3, 2.

In the prooemion of the Apostolic Church Order the Twelve Apostles are mentioned by name. The list is identical in the Greek and Syriac texts, *Ἰούδας Ἰακώβου* being rightly translated into Syriac as 'Judas the son of James.' In the Arabic and Ethiopic forms of the work this Apostle appears simply as 'Judas.' The names are given in the same order in the Sahidic and Bohairic translations also, but in these *Ἰούδας Ἰακώβου* is rendered 'Judas the brother of James.' The Syriac, Sahidic, and Bohairic are closer to the Greek original than the Arabic and Ethiopic versions. The former represent the first stage in the process of translation.

In the Arabic and Ethiopic texts, which differ materially from those just mentioned, the names and order of the Apostles are the same. The Ethiopic translation was doubtless made directly from the Arabic. The list of the Apostles in these two versions departs from the Greek original and from Christian tradition in general to the extent of containing thirteen names. This number is obtained by counting Peter and Cephas as two persons and by including two Apostles named James. The Arabic leaves them without any further designation, but the Ethiopic calls the second James "the brother of our Lord." He stands at the end of the list. The twelfth Apostle in both of these translations is Judas; but he has no distinguishing epithet, such as the 'son' or 'brother of James.'

Nevertheless, despite the differences already noted between the Arabic and Ethiopic on the one hand and the Greek, Syriac, and Coptic texts on the other, there are certain fundamental resemblances among them which betray their common origin. The first three names are the same in all the texts — John, Matthew, Peter. The preëminence of John may be due to the influence of the *Epistula Apostolorum*. Matthew comes next because he, like John, was an evangelist. Peter is third because his prominence in the gospels and at the beginning of Christian history could not be forgotten. The Apostolic Church Order in all its forms agrees with the *Epistula Apostolorum* in including Nathanael among the Apostles and in omitting James the son of Alphaeus, Thaddaeus, and Judas Iscariot. Again, as in the Ethiopic version of the *Epistula Apostolorum*,

Cephas is treated as distinct from Peter and ranked among the Apostles. The idea that these two names denoted different members of the Apostolic group is characteristic of the Christianity of Egypt and Abyssinia, where indeed it became an established ecclesiastical tradition.

In the Apostolic Church Order, as in the *Epistula Apostolorum*, the Apostles are regarded as an official body rather than as the disciples and friends of Jesus.

The last testimony to be considered in the present article is that of a learned Arab historian who lived in Egypt in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, and who is known to us as El-Maḵrîzî.³⁹

Near the end of the *Khiṭaṭ* ⁴⁰ El-Maḵrîzî treats of the history of the Copts and their religion. He does not give a formal list of the Twelve, but in relating the beginnings of Christianity mentions the various Apostles and tells where each of them labored after their dispersion. He does not say whence he obtained his information, but it must have come from an Egyptian source.

The Arab historian accepts the common Egyptian and Abyssinian idea that Peter and Cephas were different persons. Peter, who is called the head of the Apostles and is said to have been a fisherman and a tanner,⁴¹ is mentioned first. El-Maḵrîzî records that he "and Simon Cephas with him journeyed to Antioch and Rome."⁴² Peter escaped from prison in Rome and returned to Antioch. Later he went again to Rome and was put to death there by Nero on the fifth day of the month Abīb (June 29).⁴³ The year of this event is not given, but his martyrdom is said to have taken place one year

³⁹ His name was Taḳī ed-Dīn Aḥmed ibn 'Alī (1364-1442). He is called El-Maḵrîzī from Maḵrîz, a quarter of Baalbek in which his paternal ancestors lived.

⁴⁰ His principal work is an historical and topographical description of Egypt entitled *El-Mawā'iz wa'l-I'tibār fī Dhikr el-Khiṭaṭ wa'l-Athār*.

⁴¹ El-Maḵrîzī, ed. Wüstenfeld in *Abhandlungen*, Göttingen Academy, hist.-philol. Classe, III, p. 87; Arabic text, p. 36. There is probably some confusion here with Simon the Tanner (Acts 9, 43; 10, 6. 32).

⁴² *Ibid.*, p. 21; Arabic text, p. 7.

⁴³ *Ibid.*, p. 21; Arabic text, p. 7; also p. 87; Arabic text, p. 36. The martyrdom of Peter and Paul, "stars among the disciples," is commemorated on June 29 in the Coptic church.

before that of Paul,⁴⁴ who according to El-Makrizî also suffered on the fifth of Abîb.⁴⁵

According to El-Makrizî, Simon Cephas preached the gospel in Rome for twenty-five years.⁴⁶ Nothing is said about the time or manner of his death, doubtless because the author had no information. Tradition apparently did not busy itself with Simon Cephas beyond the point of attributing to him the above-mentioned residence in Rome.

The legend that Simon Cephas preached twenty-five years in Rome is an interesting variant of the tradition that Peter was bishop of Rome for twenty-five years. This last is not mentioned by Eusebius in his Ecclesiastical History; but it is related by Jerome,⁴⁷ and whether it was recorded in the Chronicle of Eusebius or not is an open question.⁴⁸

⁴⁴ El-Makrizî, p. 87; Arabic text, p. 36.

⁴⁵ Ibid., p. 22; Arabic text, p. 7. In the convent of Peter and Paul, which lay south of the district of Itfîh, the fifth of Abîb was kept as a feast-day (El-Makrizî, p. 87; Arabic text, p. 36).

⁴⁶ El-Makrizî, p. 22; Arabic text, p. 7.

⁴⁷ De viris ill. 1: Romam pergit, ibique viginti quinque annis cathedram sacerdotalem tenuit.

⁴⁸ In a fragment of Eusebius's Chronicle preserved by Syncellus it is said that, after founding the first church in Antioch, Peter *εἰς Ῥώμην ἄπεισι κηρύττων τὸ εὐαγγέλιον* (Schoene, *Eusebii Chronicorum Libri Duo*, II, p. 152). There is no mention of an episcopate in Rome or elsewhere. However, according to Jerome's version of the Chronicle, "Petrus apostolus . . . Romam mittitur. Ubi evangelium praedicans xxv annis eiusdem urbis episcopus perseverat" (Schoene, II, p. 153). The 'Epitome Syria' translated into Latin by Roediger says that Peter "in urbem Romam profectus est ibique praedicavit evangelium. Et praefuit ecclesiae illi annos 25" (Schoene, II, p. 211). On the other hand, the Armenian version translated into Latin by Petermann (Schoene, II, p. 150) and the Syriac excerpt found in the Bodleian ms. Arch. C 5 and published by Bruns (*Repertorium für biblische und morgenländische Litteratur*, XI, p. 281) limit Peter's episcopate in Rome to a period of twenty years. However, in the original form of the tradition Peter's episcopate was probably of twenty-five rather than twenty years' duration. In order to explain the discrepancies between the various versions of Eusebius's Chronicle and the Greek fragments, it has been conjectured that the work existed in an earlier and a later edition (Salmon in *Dictionary of Christian Biography*, II, pp. 322 and 352). The above-mentioned variations, however, can be accounted for quite as easily on the hypothesis that the Chronicle was subjected to one or more recensions after it left the author's hands. This would be entirely natural in the case of a chronological work that was used so much and so widely as the Chronicle of Eusebius. In the Syriac Chronicle of Dionysius Telmaharensis, which is based on Eusebius as far as the age of Constantine, nothing is said about Peter's having been bishop of Rome (Siegfried and Gelzer, *Eusebii Canonum Epitome ex Dionysii Telmaharensis Chronico Petita*, pp. 49 and 54).

The legend of a twenty-five-year episcopate in Rome is in irreconcilable conflict with certain other data concerning the life of Peter, and it must be rejected as unhistorical.⁴⁹ It is quite possible, however, that this tradition originated in connection with Cephas in a quarter in which he was thought to be distinct from Peter, and that it was later connected with Peter in those places in which it was known that Cephas and Peter were the same person. El-Makrîzî is, to be sure, a comparatively late writer, but his account of the Apostles' activity is based on much earlier traditions. Moreover, as we have already seen, there was a widespread notion before the time of El-Makrîzî that Peter and Cephas were different persons, though it was only in Egypt and Abyssinia that they were both regarded as Apostles.

Missionary labors were ascribed by tradition to each of the Apostles. For example, Lactantius says that after the ascension of Christ the Apostles went throughout the earth preaching the gospel and laying the foundations of the church for twenty-five years up to the beginning of the reign of Nero.⁵⁰

It was indeed inevitable, when Cephas was once thought to be an Apostle distinct from Peter, that some work of this sort should also become attached to his name; and this was naturally the preaching of the gospel, as it is in El-Makrîzî. When the story of Cephas's twenty-five years of preaching in Rome came to a region in which the identity of Peter and Cephas was understood, the twenty-five years' preaching was naturally transferred to Peter and interpreted as an episcopate of twenty-five years' duration. Most of the sources which mention the latter also relate that the Apostle preached the gospel in Rome.⁵¹ Thus the differentiation of Peter and Cephas at a comparatively early date and the ascription to the latter of twenty-five years' preaching in Rome serve to explain the origin of a tradi-

⁴⁹ See Chase in Hastings's *Dict. of the Bible*, III, p. 778.

⁵⁰ Migne, *P. L.* 7, col. 195.

⁵¹ Jerome's *Chronicle* (ed. Schoene, II, p. 153); the *Epitome Syria* (ed. Schoene, II, p. 211); and the *Armenian Chronicle* (ed. Schoene, II, p. 150). The Syriac excerpt published by Bruns (*op. cit.*, XI, p. 281) says nothing about Peter's preaching in Rome.

tion for which no place can be found in the life of the Apostle Peter.

It is a curious fact that El-Maḥrîzî mentions the Apostles in the order of Matthew, but instead of Thaddaeus has Judas the son of James. The latter appears not only in Luke and Acts, but also in all the forms of the Apostolic Church Order. The Arab historian, however, is not directly dependent upon the last-named work, for in other respects he differs radically from it. He doubtless was following a tradition which obtained among the Copts of his time.

Judas Iscariot is of course not included among the Apostles by El-Maḥrîzî. So, too, nothing is said about Nathanael, although he is mentioned among the Apostles in the Ethiopic version of the *Epistula Apostolorum* and in the Apostolic Church Order in all its forms. By reckoning Peter and Cephas as two persons and by adding Matthias and Paul the number of the Apostles in El-Maḥrîzî's account is raised to fourteen. This is the only one of the sources considered in the present article which mentions either the successor of Judas Iscariot or the Apostle to the gentiles. After finishing what he has to say about those whom he regards as forming the first group, El-Maḥrîzî passes at once to the seventy disciples. These he calls "seventy other apostles," and he says that they went to various countries and made many converts. Of this second group, however, he names only Mark and Luke. Apparently he had no information concerning any of the others.

Lebbaeus	10 ⁵⁵	12	12 ⁵⁶	..	12 ⁵⁷
Judas son of James	11	12	12 ⁵⁶	..	12 ⁵⁷	12 ⁵⁷	11
Nathanael	9	8	8	8	7	7	7	..
Judas Zelotes	10 ⁵³
James brother of our Lord	13	13	..
Matthias	13
Paul	14

⁵² The Arabic version of the Apostolic Church Order has the name James without any further designation at the end of the list. This is probably James the son of Alphaeus, whom the Ethiopic translator understood to be James the brother of the Lord.

⁵³ Wüstenfeld reads **يَعْقُوبُ بْنُ خَلْفَا**, which he translates 'Jacobus, der Sohn des Cleophas' (op. cit., III, p. 22; Arabic text, p. 7). But **خَلْفَا** is not the Arabic equivalent of Cleophas. It is probably a mistake for **خَلْفَا** (Alphaeus), though it may possibly be a variant form of this name.

⁵⁴ Luke calls him 'Simon Zelotes.' **Ζηλωτής** is a translation of **Καραναῖος** or its Aramaic equivalent.

⁵⁵ The following authorities have Lebbaeus: D 122 k Or^{int} codd. ap. Aug.

⁵⁶ The Sahidic and Bohairic versions have 'Judas the brother of James.'

⁵⁷ In the Arabic and Ethiopic versions Judas has no distinguishing epithet.

⁵⁸ 'Judas Zelotes' is also found in a b g h q gat mm at Matt. 10, 3 as well as in the Roman Chronography of the year 354. Cf. Mommsen, *Über den Chronographen vom J. 354*, p. 640.

